1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA ADRIENNE HENNING, 10 11 Plaintiff, No. CIV S-05-0531 FCD KJM PS 12 VS. 13 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., 14 Defendants. ORDER 15 16 Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed the above-entitled action. The matter was 17 referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 72-302(c)(21). 18 On November 17, 2006, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations 19 herein which were served on the parties and which contained notice to the parties that any 20 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within ten days. No objections 21 to the findings and recommendations have been filed. 22 The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be 23 supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that: 24 25 1. The findings and recommendations filed November 17, 2006, are adopted in 26 full;

1	2. The motion for summary judgment of defendants Sacramento County and
2	Sacramento County Sheriff's Department is granted; and
3	3. The motion for summary judgment of the individual defendants is denied.
4	DATED: January 19, 2007.
5	9/108)
6	EDANIK C. DANDELL ID
7	(FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	